

**Attention: Michigan Supreme Court Justices**

“May it please the court,” I’ll attempt to keep the introduction short so that substantive purposes may more efficiently be addressed. My name is Charles Taylor, and I am a current resident of Brownstown Township, and have been a resident of the State of Michigan, falling squarely within your jurisdiction, for over 50 years. Only now, as a senior citizen weathered by my years as a steel worker, have I become concerned with the Court’s ability to protect my interests in the face of pressure from big industry lobbyists.

Though I largely consider myself a Republican, my support for my cohorts’ efforts to change the current law is jaded by a history of health problems – primarily respiratory illnesses – my physicians attribute to my years of exposure to asbestos in my capacity as a steel worker. The symptoms I have continued to exhibit are debilitating and unyielding. It is my understanding that the law has recognized the rights of parties, as a matter of health, fairness, and tort theory, to seek redress for injuries suffered as a result of neglect and undue exposure to hazardous conditions. Further, given that the remedies available at the agency level (OSHA for example) are largely nugatory and laughably disproportionate, the courts clearly serve as the more appropriate venue. Finally, as I feel you would agree that the issues underlying determinations of restitution are most suitable for a trier of fact, the rights of asbestos victims to appear before a jury on such matters must not be diminished.

I don’t mean to suggest that the Court is, as of yet, prejudice in its consideration of the proposal, but would ask that the Court observe the imbalance of power between big industry and asbestos victims to affect legislation. Perhaps I am somewhat jaded by recent revelations of corporate disregard for citizens, which seems to be polluting our country’s atmosphere of late. I am nonetheless suspicious, however, of its potential perpetuity short of judicial intervention. Further, I would ask that the Court practice great restraint when considering the proposed rule – resisting whatever temptations it might have to substitute interpretation with functions more commonly reserved for legislators.

**Please accept this as an expression of my strong opposition to the Proposed Court Rule No. 2003-47.**

Sincerely,



Charles V. Taylor

